

JAMES P. HAO  
ANTHONY C. MURABITO  
JOHN P. WAGNER, JR.  
GLENN D. BARNES  
MATTHEW J. BLECHER  
THOMAS M. CATALE  
JOSE S. GARCIA  
ERIC J. GASH  
LAWRENCE R. GOERKE  
MICHAEL R. HARDAWAY  
LIN C. HSU  
RAMBOD NADER  
RONALD M. POMERENKE  
REGINALD A. RATLIFF  
JOHN F. RYAN

CHERYL A. EICHSTAEDT\*  
M. DEAN MATTHEWS\*  
JOEL M. YOUNG\*  
WILLIAM A. ZAKBIS\*  
DAVID A. GREWER\*\*  
NEAL A. OSBORN\*\*  
DAVID J. REIMLER\*\*  
CAROLINE W. SMITH\*\*  
ARTHUR M. TONSAGER, III\*\*

\* PATENT AGENT  
\*\* PATENT ENGINEER

WAGNER  
MURABITO  
& HAO LLP  
PATENT ATTORNEYS

TWO NORTH MARKET STREET  
THIRD FLOOR  
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113  
TELEPHONE: (408) 938-9060  
FACSIMILE: (408) 938-9069  
[www.wmhpattents.com](http://www.wmhpattents.com)

### FAX COVER SHEET

SEND TO: Examiner Hahn B. Thai

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX NUMBER: (703) 746-9099

TRANSMISSION DATE: 5/5/04

09/732,541  
FILE REF: C30-68341

FROM: Ron Pomerence

PAGE NUMBERS (including this sheet): 3

OPERATOR: Hannon

NOTES: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If there should be a problem with the quality of this transmission or you do not receive all of the pages, please call the operator named above at (408) 938-9060.

### CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This FACSIMILE transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain information that is confidential, attorney-client privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, reproduction, distribution or use of any of the information contained in this transmission is strictly PROHIBITED by law. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and we will arrange the return of the original transmission to us at no expense to you. Thank you.

Page 1 of 2EXAMINER INTERVIEW AGENDA

In re Application of:

Zoller, et al.

Serial No. 09/732,541

Filing Date: December 7, 2000

For: Method and Device for a User  
Profile Repository

Examiner: Thai, Hahn B.

Art Unit: 2171

A) 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, Written Description

1) Step e) in Claim 10?

B) Claim 8

1) Limitations related to tracking a user record are not discussed in rejection.

1) Hoover, col. 54, lines 15-17 not related to tracking user record.

2) Limitation of said central repository deleting said user record if said user record is inactive, based on the received parameter not discussed in rejection of Claim 8.

3) Security parameter and instance attributes are not used to track active records, as claimed. (Hoover col. 29, lines 1-1, col. 28, line 63).

C) 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, Written Description

1) Specification page 1, lines 1-6 and page 12, lines 16-21.D) Motivation to combine Hoover/Challenger to arrive at Claim 31) Hoover teaches away from a central repository moving a portion of said information between client nodes that are done transparently to the applications on the client nodes.

2) Rejection asserts security is motivation to combine: security issue does not motivate one to store information in a cache as claimed.

Serial No. 09/732,541  
Examiner: Thai, Hahn B.

- 1 -

Art Unit 2171  
CSCO-68341

PAGE 2 of 2

E) Motivation to combine Hoover/Challenger/Gaisor to arrive at Claim 1

1) Applicants have previously noted that moving data between the databases would render Hoover inoperable as it would defeat security issues. That is, Hoover teaches that the updating is always under the control of the applications running on the client nodes. This is done for security and control reasons. (see, e.g., Hoover, col. 34, line 35 - col. 38, line 18.)

2) Rejection's stated motivation: flexibility of data storage (Where is objective evidence in the prior art?)

F) Claim 6, depending from claim 4, recites: central repository updating a first of said plurality of fields in said set of said information by writing information to a first of said plurality of databases, wherein said update is based upon monitoring activity of a user of said application program, said activity being related to said information.

1) monitoring status of data is not monitoring activity of a user (col. 3, lines 14-24)

2) monitoring program (Hoover col. 39, lines 45 - col. 4, line 24) does not write to the databases.

i) information is requested (Hoover col. 39, line 61).

ii) update is to map table, index table associated with ORB

3) issuing a GET message to retrieve information about a patient is not monitoring a user's activity (Hoover col. 53, lines 23-27).

G) Claim 38 - Hoover's fails to teach or suggest API useable through the ORB that allows reading and updating records on the plurality of databases.

1) Applicants note that Hoover teaches an ORB that has an API supporting "SEARCH, ADD, GET, UPDATE." Hoover's UPDATE message is not used to update the record, but rather for the client nodes to report that a record was updated.

Ronald M. Pomerence  
Registration No. 43,009  
(408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile

Serial No: 09/732,541  
Examiner: Thai, Hahn B.

- 2 -

Art Unit 2171  
CSCO-68341